



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,621	12/03/2004	Tatsuo Tsuncka	SAE-036	5295
20374	7590	11/16/2007		
KUBOVCIK & KUBOVCIK SUITE 710 900 17TH STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER CHEUNG, WILLIAM K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,621	Applicant(s) TSUNEKA ET AL.
	Examiner William K. Cheung	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner acknowledges the receipt of the amendment filed August 30, 2007.

Claims 6-11 are pending.

Invention Summary

The invention of claims 6-11 relates to a process for producing an aqueous resin dispersion composition consisting essentially of an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin, basic substances and water and without the use of an emulsifier comprising the steps of, in order:

dissolving an acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin in an ethereal solvent;

adding a basic substance to the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin to neutralize;

adding a dispersion medium consisting of water to disperse the neutralized acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin therein; and removing the ethereal solvent to obtain the aqueous resin dispersion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,150,076), for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 4 of the office action of May 30, 2007.

Yamamoto et al. (col. 7, line 27-36) disclose a process for preparing a photosensitive resin composition comprising the components to be dissolved in any order and mixed in an appropriate solvent such as tetrahydrofuran, dioxane which can swell, disperse. Then the ethereal solvent is removed at the end of the process.

Regarding the claimed "adding a basic substance to the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin to neutralize", Yamamoto et al. (col. 5, line 12-29) clearly disclose a step of adding an amine to the photosensitive resin composition to obtain a specific pH. Further, Yamamoto et al. (col. 4, line 5-11) disclose that the chlorinated polyethylene has about 10-50 wt% of chlorine.

Because Yamamoto et al. (col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 4) clearly disclose the specific commercially available chlorinated polyethylene products inherently possess a

specific molecular weight ranges and that the claimed molecular weight range of claim 9 is quite broad, the examiner has a reasonable basis that that claimed molecular weight range is possessed in Yamamoto et al.

The examiner acknowledges that Yamamoto et al. (col. 6, line 20-28) disclose that when water is used, a surfactant such as sodium alkylbenzenesulfonate, sodium alkylnaphthalenesulfonate,...may be contained in the water. However, Yamamoto et al. do not teach that a surfactant must be used. Therefore, the examiner has a reasonable basis that the claimed process fully encompasses processes that do not involve the use of an emulsifier.

Regarding the claimed "acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin", Yamamoto et al. (col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 4) disclose generically all chlorinated polyethylene (including the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin as claimed) is a one of the components of the disclosed photosensitive resin composition.

The difference between the invention of claims 6-11 and Yamamoto et al. is that Yamamoto et al. do not disclose that the chlorinated polyethylene has be acid-modified.

However, the teachings of Yamamoto et al. (col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 4) generically include all chlorinated polyethylene, which include the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin as claimed. Motivated by the expectation of success of developing the process of preparing a photosensitive resin composition (abstract), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to recognize that an acid-modified chlorinated

polyethylene is still within the scope of chlorinated polyethylene teachings of Yamamoto et al. to obtain the invention of claims 6-11.

4. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 6,150,076) in view of Sales (US 5,169,888), for the reasons adequately set forth from paragraph 5 of the office action of May 30, 2007.

Yamamoto et al. (col. 7, line 27-36) disclose a process for preparing a photosensitive resin composition comprising the components to be dissolved in any order and mixed in an appropriate solvent such as tetrahydrofuran, dioxane which can swell, disperse. Then the ethereal solvent is removed at the end of the process.

Regarding the claimed "adding a basic substance to the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin to neutralize", Yamamoto et al. (col. 5, line 12-29) clearly disclose a step of adding an amine to the photosensitive resin composition to obtain a specific pH. Further, Yamamoto et al. (col. 4, line 5-11) disclose that the chlorinated polyethylene has about 10-50 wt% of chlorine.

Because Yamamoto et al. (col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 4) clearly disclose the specific commercially available chlorinated polyethylene products inherently possess a specific molecular weight ranges and that the claimed molecular weight range of claim 9 is quite broad, the examiner has a reasonable basis that that claimed molecular weight range is possessed in Yamamoto et al.

The examiner acknowledges that Yamamoto et al. (col. 6, line 20-28) disclose that when water is used, a surfactant such as sodium alkylbenzenesulfonate, sodium alkylnaphthalenesulfonate,...may be contained in the water. However, Yamamoto et al. do not teach that a surfactant must be used. Therefore, the examiner has a reasonable basis that the claimed process fully encompasses processes that do not involve the use of an emulsifier.

Regarding the claimed "acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin", Yamamoto et al. (col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 4) disclose generically all chlorinated polyethylene (including the acid-modified chlorinated polyolefin as claimed) is a one of the components of the disclosed photosensitive resin composition.

The difference between the invention of claims 6-11 and Yamamoto et al. is that Yamamoto et al. do not disclose that the chlorinated polyethylene has be acid-modified.

Sales (col. 2, line 56-68) discloses the advantages of using a chlorinated polyethylene that has been acid-modified, which would make the chlorinated polyethylene suitable as vehicle for printing inks or adhesives. Therefore, motivated by the expectation of success of developing a resin composition that is suitable for the printing ink or adhesive industries, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in art to replace the chlorinated polyethylene of Yamamoto et al. with the acid-modified polyethylene of Sales to obtain the invention of claim 6-11.

Regarding the claimed "0.1 to 10 wt%" of claim 7, Sales (col. 2, line 56-68) clearly discloses using a chlorinated polyethylene that has been acid-modified at an undisclosed level of acid functionalities. However, applicants must recognize that "acid-modified" implies that the level of acid functional group incorporation should be less than 50wt%, which inherently possess the "0.1 to 10 wt%" of claim 7.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 30, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that the amended claims now require the exclusion of the hydrophilic polymer (B) disclosed in Yamamoto et al. However, the examiner disagrees because applicants fail to provide that the hydrophilic polymer (B) of Yamamoto et al. would affect the process as claimed. To obtain a valid patent, applicants must submit a proof for each of the excluded species or components in Yamamoto et al. would affect the basic properties of the claimed process.

Regarding the claimed "removing the ethereal solvent to obtain the aqueous resin dispersion", since the claim does not require all ethereal solvent to be removed and that the aqueous dispersion of Yamamoto would remain as an aqueous dispersion until all the solvent have evaporated, the examiner has a reasonable basis that the amendment filed August 30, 2007 is inadequate for overcoming the rejections set forth.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William K. Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1097. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM to 2:00PM; 4:00PM to 8:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David WU can be reached on (571) 272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/516,621
Art Unit: 1796

Page 9

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



William K. Cheung, Ph. D.

Primary Examiner

November 12, 2007

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER